

CLARK COUNTY BUILDING DEPARTMENT

Engineering Plans Review Service Goals August 2013



TIMELINESS								
TYPE OF PROJECT	Queue Time Goal (Cal. Days)	# Plan Reviews Performed	No Plans Exceeding Time Frame	% Exceeding Time Frame	%Goal Achieved	Target Goal %	+ or - % of Goal	
Complex Commercial (SPP)	42	0	0	0.0%	100.0%	90%	10.0%	
Commercial (> \$300,000) (COM)	21	47	0	0.0%	100.0%	90%	10.0%	
Minor Commercial (< \$300,000) (CMSH)	14	118	0	0.0%	100.0%	90%	10.0%	
Commercial Over-the-Counter (T.I.'s) (COTC)	1	44	0	0.0%	100.0%	90%	10.0%	
Residential Standard Plans (STPL)	14	12	0	0.0%	100.0%	90%	10.0%	
Custom Residence (RES)	14	22	0	0.0%	100.0%	90%	10.0%	
Minor Residential Additions/Alterations (RSH)	14	46	0	0.0%	100.0%	90%	10.0%	
Residential Over-the-Counter (ROTC)	1	65	0	0.0%	100.0%	90%	10.0%	
Plan Revisions	10	219	0	0.0%	100.0%	90%	10.0%	
PRODUCTIVITY								
TYPE OF PROJECT	# Plan R		ews Total		Plan Review Hours Req.		Total Review Hrs	
	New	Revision		New	Revision	Required		
Complex Commercial (SPP)	0	57	57	0	448		8.0	
Commercial (> \$300,000) (COM)	47	65	112	336	260			
Minor Commercial (< \$300,000) (CMSH)	118	24	142	290	24			
Commercial Over-the-Counter (T.I.'s) (COTC)	44	4	48	10.833	0.833			
Residential Standard Plans (STPL)	12	40	52	112	80			
Custom Residence (RES)	22	13	35	120	28	}		
Minor Residential Additions/Alterations (RSH)	46	13	59	118	13			
Residential Over-the-Counter (ROTC)	65	3	68	15.916	0.75			
Customer (Q-Matic)	07.	637			9.3	159.3 2016.6		
TOTAL	354	219	573	1003	855	201	16.6	
Total Building Plan Review Staff:	8							
Total Review Credit Hrs:	2016.6	Hours	•	Total Hours Worked:		1034.00	Hours	
# Reviews per FTE:	252.1				Efficiency:	195.0%		
ACCURACY								
TYPE OF PLAN REVIEW	Score Goal (pts)	# QC Reviews Performed	# QC Goal Not Met	% # QC Goal Not Met	%Goal Achieved	Target Goal %	+ or - % of Goal	
Structural/Grading	85%	2	0	0.0%	100.0%	85.0%	15.0%	
TOTAL		2	0	0.0%	100.0%	85.0%	15.0%	
CUSTOMER SERVICE								
SURVEY TOPIC	Goal (Positive)	Number of Surveys		Results		+ or - % of Goal		
Timeliness of Service	80%			n/a		n/a		
Courteous/Helpful Staff	80%	n/a		n/a		n/a		
Staff Competency in Handling Issues	80%	n/a		n/a		n/a		
Staff Professionalism	80%	n/a		n/a		n/a		
Customers Treated Fairly/Equitably	80%	n/a		n/a		n/a		
Customer Issues Handled Thoroughly	80%			n/a		n/a		
Customer's Overall Rating	80%	n/a		n/a		n/a		